

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on July 28, 2006.

Claims 1 – 3, 7, 12 – 14, 17 and 20 – 23 are amended, claims 5, 8, 11, 19, 27 and 28 are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1 – 4, 6 – 7, 9 – 10, 12 – 18 and 20 – 26 are now pending in this application. Claims 24 – 26 are currently withdrawn from consideration. Claim 8 was previously cancelled.

### **Objection to the Drawings**

The drawings were objected to because the word “SUPPLEMENTAL” is misspelled in Figs. 2 and 3. Replacement sheets are submitted to correct the typographical error. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for noting this.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 11 and 19 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 11 and to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as discussed below.

Claim 12 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 19 and to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as discussed below.

Claims 27 and 28 were also indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action. Claims 27 and 28 have been cancelled because of the substantial similarity to claims 1 and 12 as currently amended.

### **§112 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-7, 9-23, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended clarify that the supply-switching subcircuit has a well tap coupled to the data retention subcircuits and that the semiconductor die has a resistive n-well coupling a supplemental supply voltage to the well tap. As further recited in claim 1, the supplemental supply voltage biases the resistive n-well allowing leakage current to flow from the supplemental supply voltage through the resistive n-well to the well tap and to the data retention subcircuits to allow the data-retention subcircuits to remain powered and retain their state during standby mode .

Applicant submits that it is now clear that the leakage current flows from the supplemental supply voltage, through the resistive well to the well tap to bias the data retention subcircuits during standby mode. Independent claims 1, 12 and 20 have been similarly amended. In view of this, Applicant submits that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome. The corresponding dependent claims have been amended to reflect the amendments to the independent claims.

### §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 3, 7, 12, 14 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Stan et al. (U.S. 6,538,471) or Ooishi (U.S. 6,535,433) in view of any one of Levinson (U.S. 5,880,623), Notani et al. (U.S. 6,556,071) Ooishi (U.S. 5,801,576), Mulatti et al. (U.S. 6,307,396) and Bhavnagarwala et al. (U.S. 6,977,519), and further in view of Ogawa (U.S. 6,246,265).

Independent claims 1 and 12 are believed to be in condition for allowance because they have been amended to include the limitations of claims 11 and 19, respectively, and to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as discussed above. Independent claim 20 has also been amended to include the structural limitations of amended claim 1, and is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 2 – 4, 6 – 7, 9 – 10 are believed to be allowable at least because of their dependence on claim 1.

Dependent claims 13 – 18 are believed to be allowable at least because of their dependence on claim 12.

Dependent claims 21 – 23 are believed to be allowable at least because of their dependence on claim 20.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (480) 659-3314 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

RANDY J. AKSAMIT

By their Representatives,  
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(480) 659-3314

By /  /

Gregory J. Gorrie  
Reg. No. 36,530